DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 470 CS 007 799

AUTHOR Escoe, Adrienne
TITLE Remedial Reading and English Instruction for Junior High and High School Students: A Description of Common Practices in Teaching and Assessment.
INSTITUTION Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Los Alamitos, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO SWRL-TR-75
PUB DATE 15 Jan 82
CONTRACT NE-0-00-3-0064
NOTE 80p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English Instruction; Evaluation Methods; High Schools; *Instructional Materials; Junior High Schools; *Reading Instruction; *Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Reading; Student Evaluation; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Focusing on schools in southern California, Arizona, and Nevada, this report uses information from several sources, including surveys of school personnel and analyses of instructional and assessment materials, to document the common practices and effects of junior high and high school remedial reading and English instruction. The first two parts of the report treat the junior high and high school levels, respectively, with the presentation organized as follows: (1) an overview of practices in remedial instruction; (2) the structure of instruction, including students served, entry and termination skills, instructional time, facilities, and staff; and (3) the scope of instruction, including skills taught, materials, and general methods of instruction. The report concludes with a general discussion of the findings and a direction suggested for surveying the requirements for literacy at the start of training programs and employment. Appendixes include a list of skills and tasks from a sample district curriculum guide, a bibliography of remedial materials, and scores from graduation proficiency tests. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED249470

SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SWRI
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Remedial Reading and English Instruction for Junior High and High School Students: A Description of Common Practices in Teaching and Assessment

CS 007 799

TR 76 January 15, 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This document has been distributed to a limited audience for a limited purpose. It is not published. Copies may be made only with the written permission of SWRL Educational Research and Development, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720. The work upon which this document is based was performed pursuant to Contract NE-0-00-3-0064 with the National Institute of Education. SWRL reports do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of SWRL R&D.

SWRL EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

TECHNICAL REPORT 75

January 15, 1982

REMEDIAL READING AND ENGLISH INSTRUCTION FOR JUNIOR HIGH AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS: A DESCRIPTION OF COMMON PRACTICES IN TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Adrienne Escoe*

ABSTRACT

Common practices and effects of remedial reading and English instruction in the junior highs and high schools are described in this report. Both the structure and scope of the two levels of post-elementary instruction are discussed, including students served, entry and termination skills, instructional time, facilities, staff, skills taught, materials, and general methods of instruction. A concluding section pays particular attention to the need for surveying the requirements for literacy at the end of high school and the start of training programs and employment.

---

*This report is based upon information gathered by a study team of the author, Susan Nack, and Gail Pratt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
PART I: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS	
Overview of Practices in Junior High Remedial Instruction	5
Structure of Junior High Remedial Instruction	7
Scope of Junior High Remedial Instruction	15
PART II: HIGH SCHOOLS	
Overview of Practices in High School Remedial Instruction	27
Structure of High School Remedial Instruction	31
Scope of High School Remedial Instruction	45
Summary and Conclusions	53
References	57
Other Sources of Information	59
Appendices	
A. What the Basic Student is	65
B. Example of a District Curriculum Guide List of Skills and Tasks, Grades 7-9	69
C. Remedial Reading and English Materials Used in Junior Highs and High Schools	73
D. High School Graduation Proficiency Tests (Objective)	81
E. High School Graduation Proficiency Tests (Writing Sample).	85

REMEDIAL READING AND ENGLISH INSTRUCTION FOR JUNIOR HIGH AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS: A DESCRIPTION OF COMMON PRACTICES IN TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Adrienne Escoe

Introduction

This report documents the common practices and effects of remedial reading and English instruction at two levels of schooling: junior highs and high schools. The information presented is derived from several sources: in-person and telephone surveys with school and school-district personnel, analyses of materials used for instruction and assessment, and to a lesser extent, review of the professional literature. The inquiry focuses upon the SWRL geographic area (Southern California, Arizona, and Clark County, Nevada), but is not exclusive of the instructional needs of underprepared youth nationwide.

In many ways, instruction is the same at both the junior high and high school levels. For example, the image of the student projected at the completion of remedial instruction at both levels is often directed by legislatively-mandated proficiency tests. Also both the junior high and the high school use many of the same textbooks for remedial instruction. Another example of similarity is that the assessment of skills is structured the same way for both. In some respects, however, junior highs differ from high schools. For example, elements of subject matter from the elementary school that are not usually taught at the high school level are often a component of remediation in the junior high. Then, too, teaching methodology sometimes differs between the two levels of schooling. Because of these commonalities and differences, instruction at both levels is described in this single report, but the description is presented separately. Parts I and II of the report treats the junior high and high school separately with the presentation organized as follows: an overview of practices in remedial instruction at that level; the structure of instruction, including students served, entry and termination skills, instructional time, facilities, and staff; and the scope of instruction, including skills taught, materials, and general methods of instruction. At the conclusion of the report is a general discussion of the findings and a direction suggested for surveying the requirements for literacy at the start of training programs and employment.

PART I: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

OVERVIEW OF PRACTICES IN JUNIOR HIGH REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION

The current picture presented by remedial instruction in junior high schools is not stable nor uniform. Programs in general are in a state of flux, and both the structure and content of remedial instruction vary with the district, the school, and often with the grade level. But the picture is not surprising, since the junior high school is a young institution of schooling compared to elementary and high schools. In the establishment and continuity of instructional programs tailored specifically for the disabled reader, the elementary schools have been ahead by about eighty years, and the high schools generally since the Second World War.

The junior high school has for the most part developed as an upward extension of the elementary school and as a downward extension of the high school. It was designed to meet the unique schooling needs of pre-adolescents; but that group of students was and is hard to identify and harder still to "corral" according to chronological age. When the junior high school emerged, it changed the traditional 8-4 grade level pattern to 6-3-3, 6-2-4, or 6-6, and later to 5-2-5 or 5-3-4, as the concept of the middle school caught on. Today we still see variety in junior high grades: some go from fifth grade to eighth, some seventh to ninth, others some combination of these grades.

As a downward extension of the high school, the junior high is also put in the position of responding to legislative mandates for demonstrated competencies in basic skills, especially for high school graduation. Thus, both the structure and content of junior high instruction is currently under close scrutiny with reshuffling of priorities, introduction of remedial instruction where it was previously lacking, and modification of existing remedial programs to conform to high school prerequisites.

STRUCTURE OF JUNIOR HIGH REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION

Student population. The student in a program of remedial instruction in a junior high typically displays observable characteristics that cut across subject areas. For example, disabled readers often are considered to have severe problems in spelling or handwriting as well as low achievement in one or more of the other core subjects such as social studies. Many students show maladjustment in routine classroom functioning such as attendance, participation in group activities, cooperative behavior, completion of assigned work, and on and on. Appendix A provides a list of student characteristics that one school district has included in a draft of their guide for teaching Basic English to students in grades seven to nine. If we add to this list the observation that many students who are far behind grade level in reading and English skills use a primary language or dialect that is appreciably different from the one used by their teachers and by their textbooks and worksheets, we have a pretty good general description of the characteristics of language, learning, behavior, attitude, and background shared by many students who participate in remedial instruction.

Entry skills. In general, the older a group of students, the greater is the range of their abilities in school. For example, children at the completion of the third grade typically will vary from non-readers to those who can read textbooks written at the fifth grade level. But by the time students reach the seventh grade, the range has stretched to nine grade levels or more.

The most common source of information on the skills of junior high school entrants is their scores on a standardized test given during the last year of elementary school. Often the recommendations of elementary-school counselors are considered along with test scores for placing students into a program of remedial instruction. Sometimes informal testing is conducted by junior high staff at the start of the school year; and these results contribute to a placement decision. A brief sketch of

the placement procedures currently followed in four school districts within SWRL's region may help to illustrate how a student gets into a junior high remedial program. The examples also raise some questions about how well these procedures yield useful information about the skills students have in place when they leave elementary school and can build on in junior high.

One large, urban school district in California identifies students for remedial instruction in junior high on the basis of either the California Achievement Tests (CAT) or the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) administered in the elementary school, and usually upon the recommendation of sixth-grade counselors. The results of both the reading and the language usage subtests are considered. In another district with similar characteristics, students are screened in the sixth grade via whatever standardized test is routinely given; the tests most often used are the Gates-MacGinitie, CTBS, or Nelson-Denny. Most junior highs in this district also conduct informal screening early in the seventh grade. A smaller school district in Arizona identifies remedial students by scores on the CAT administered at the end of sixth grade.

Survey data allow us to draw a tentative profile of skills brought by a junior high school entrant to a program of remedial instruction. This student, typically, can decode words that are short and fairly regular (sound-to-spelling correspondence), and can recognize by sight at least a small group of other, common words. This student can also identify simple, clearly-stated details in text, but has trouble with comprehension of the information implied by those details. In the other language arts, the remedial student can write a few words at a time or short phrases and generally speaks the same way. Many can express themselves in complete sentences, but these are usually kernel sentences which lack depth and do not express relationships of ideas. Larger units of writing, such as paragraphs or themes, are rarely organized as a coherent whole. Listening comprehension tends to be weak for this group of students, especially if the text heard is lengthy, complex, or requires inference of a subtlety.

Termination skills. We could change this subheading to Tests without having to alter a bit of our description of practices under it. Junior high schools seem to be in accord in projecting an image of the student at the completion of remedial instruction as rejoining the ranks of college-bound high-schoolers. The goal of remedial instruction is to bring up to expected grade level students who for whatever reason or reasons fell behind their more proficient peers in elementary school. Expression of a grade level requires quantification, and tests yield quantified results, so junior highs administer tests to determine how far students have come toward the goal of remedial instruction--bringing students up to expected grade-level performance. The termination skills are the responses to whatever test is administered at the completion of junior high.

The test administered, however, may not measure skills that have been taught, and scores on it may not reflect gains in skills. A student whose score falls in a very low percentile at the end of the sixth grade is likely to score very low again at the end of the ninth--despite substantial progress in skills. No one in the schools wants to bind students into a self-fulfilling prophecy, but expecting that students who score at the bottom on a standardized test will raise their scores on this measure dramatically after remedial instruction is unrealistic for psychometric reasons which may be independent of students' accomplishments in school.

At a meeting of one district's junior high principals and English Department heads, I listened to a discussion about report card grades for Basic English. One participant commented upon a hypothetical, conscientious student whose school work improves from "F" quality to "A" quality in a Basic English class. The participant asked, "Does he get an 'A' on his report card, even though his work would be considered merely 'C' quality in regular classes? Does he get a 'C,' even though all his work is graded 'A'?" This dilemma reflects a more general situation presented by remedial instruction. Students can learn a lot in a remedial program, but they'll usually look as if they haven't learned very much at all if conventional psychometric procedures are used to describe the learning.

The current state of remedial instruction in the junior highs suggests that determining students' progress in reachable skills would be a useful activity. Some school districts have developed their own tests ostensibly to meet this need. However, the tests emulate the characteristics of norm-referenced tests.

Time. School people are starting to speak of time as a limited resource. In the past, if students didn't learn what was expected of them, it was implicitly assumed they would learn it later; or they would learn it now, and they would pick up later whatever they missed while they were pulled out for special instruction; that is, they would be able to catch up. Sometimes, later was pushed ahead so far that it was relegated to life after graduation. Now schools must demonstrate that students are learning at least a portion of what is expected of them, and the students must, for practical purposes, learn it within a given time frame.

Time added for remedial instruction must be subtracted from time available for all instruction. The result is that skills taught to students in a remedial program tend to be quite limited; often they are the same skills tested for minimum proficiency, and sometimes they're just about the only skills taught to these students.

Instructional time in general in a junior high school seems to disappear through the cracks. Especially where students or teachers change classrooms when they change subjects, much time is spent on non-teaching activities, such as calling the roll, collecting papers, distributing books and other materials, calming down, motivating up, and on and on. And students who are receiving remedial instruction often bring to the classroom many behaviors that consume an even larger chunk of instructional time. What tends to happen in a classroom where day after day there is less time than planned for instruction is that certain skill areas are covered while others get forgotten. Usually these skill areas are either the ones that are seen as being most important or the ones that are packaged in a highly-structured and an easy-to-administer

form. In the typical remedial reading classroom, where there is a shortage of time, written practice exercises usually take priority over directed or sustained reading. In the remedial English classroom, teachers usually get around to spelling skills; but speaking and listening skills are taught only when there's time remaining.

A large California school district is launching a remedial English program this year with an attempt to control time spent on instruction. In the curriculum guide, a weekly schedule is displayed for Basic English classes. The schedule apportions time within a 5-period week of 50-minute classes to writing, literature, spelling, speaking, and listening (more about content will come later in this report). The notable features of the schedule are 1) a statement which "sells" adherence to the schedule, and 2) a statement of skill emphasis along with an analysis of time allocated to each skill area. The schedule is telling teachers 1) that the curriculum taught should be balanced, and 2) which areas should receive priority in instruction. A copy of the schedule follows this page.

Schools are beginning to find other ways to respond to the time problems of remedial instruction. According to a resource teacher in reading, another large California school district, for example, is using the content of the social studies curriculum to teach reading skills to disabled readers. The merger ostensibly saves the amount of classroom time normally consumed by one of these subjects.

Facilities. Space used for remedial instruction varies widely among schools, and is usually dependent upon numbers of students served and trained staff. In large urban districts, for instance, there are often large numbers of students receiving remedial instruction in each school. Junior highs in these districts are starting to divert classrooms away from regular instruction. Enough students are removed from regular instruction to free classrooms for remedial instruction. In schools having few students who require remedial instruction, either special resource rooms are used, or

WEEKLY SCHEDULE

Follow this schedule every week, adhering to the time allotted for each activity. In this way, students will receive balanced English instruction.

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Journal 10 min.	Listening 10 min.	Journal 10 min.	Listening 10 min.	Journal 10 min.
Spelling 10 min.	*Literature 40 min.	Spelling 10 min.	**Writing 40 min.	Spelling 10 min.
*Literature 30 min.		Oral 30 min.		**Writing 30 min.
CLOSURE				

To get an idea of emphasis on the communication skills, time could be allocated as follows:

Minutes	Type of Activity
	Writing:
30	Journal writing
70	Structured writing/language study
70	Literature
30	Spelling
30	Oral Language (Speaking)
20	Listening

* If a student is also taking a reading class, the time spent on literature may be reduced slightly.

** Writing days will be alternated between a directed writing activity one week and a language study lesson using the language book the next week.

makeshift arrangements are made, such as meeting in the cafeteria, conference room, a corner of the regular classroom, and so on. If remedial instruction is practiced largely within regular classrooms, it's not usually the result of lack of physical space--space generally is not the problem it was a few years back when student enrollment was high--rather, it's probably a function of the availability of trained staff.

Staff. Like time, staff has more influence on the scope and nature of instruction than has been generally recognized. The lower grades of junior high school, usually grade six but occasionally grade seven, tend to follow a pattern of staffing that is widespread at the elementary school: the regular classroom teacher, whether in a self-contained or team-teaching arrangement, teaches reading and the other language arts. A reading specialist is likely to teach remedial reading and sometimes language arts at this level. The higher grades of junior high tend to follow the same pattern as the high schools, i.e., English (usually usage, writing, and literature) is taught by an English teacher in a departmentalized set-up. Teachers may be assigned permanently to a classroom or may change classrooms during a given day.

In the past, if reading instruction was provided in the upper grades, it was usually a peripheral service extended only to the most severely disabled readers, and usually by high-school trained English teachers in their regular classrooms. Later on, teachers who were trained in elementary-school teaching methods were assigned by the junior high schools to teach remedial reading to these older youngsters. Finally, colleges began to train their students for positions in remedial reading in the junior and senior highs. As more trained staff became available, more ambitious programs in remedial reading instruction began to develop in the junior high at all grade levels.

Remedial instruction in the other language arts at the junior high school level has lagged behind reading but seems to be following in its path; large school districts are beginning to provide the time and staff

for catch-up instruction in writing, speaking, listening, and literature, and a few colleges have begun to offer special training for teaching these skills. At the present time, however, staffing for remedial instruction in language arts at the higher grade levels is mostly a matter of scrambling for whatever teachers schools can get whenever funds are available. English teachers are assigned these classes, but so are social studies teachers, and others with diverse training and teaching backgrounds. According to an administrator at a local school district, the number of students who enter remedial English classes is virtually servant to the availability of trained staff.

SCOPE OF JUNIOR HIGH REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION

Skills taught. Like the structure of remedial reading instruction for junior high schools, the scope has also been an extension of the elementary school and the high school; the instruction tends to be a hybrid of elementary school remedial reading and high school English classes. For example, it is not unusual to find a remedial reading class studying the "sounds" of initial consonant digraphs (e.g., ch and th) in the same period as it studies elements of narrative writing.

Skills taught in a remedial reading or language arts program depend heavily on staffing (as noted above), and in turn on the structure of the education program. If the school can draw upon enough specially-trained (or flexible!) teachers, there may be remedial classes in both reading and English. Some schools have remedial classes only in reading, others (more rarely) only in English. Two fairly common situations in the junior high are for a student to have a remedial reading class coupled with a regular English class or just a remedial reading class alone. In both situations, responsibility for delivering catch-up instruction in the other language arts often falls to the remedial reading teacher, but sometimes the regular English teacher will be responsible for teaching these skills. It should be pretty obvious that junior highs do not present a uniform picture of skills taught in reading and language arts, at least for those students who are achieving less than expected for youths of their age. It's also a good bet that instructional practices currently observed in junior highs will continue to change considerably in the next few years in response to legislative, community, and staff pressures.

The bulk of the information in this section derives from two sources: a description of the skills taught in several textbook series that are used in remedial instruction in many districts, and a description of the skills specified in the newest remedial instructional plan we've seen in a large school district. Textbook series designed especially for students who have not achieved as much as expected by traditional schedules of progress are

a fairly new phenomenon on the scene in secondary education. Presently there are about a handful of widely-used "whole program" series published in reading and English targeted for this group of students. Of these, we've looked at Rally! (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980), Signal (Scott, Foresman, 1977), Impact on Reading (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), and Vistas (Houghton Mifflin). We also examined Essential Reading Skills (McDougal, Littell, 1982), a single-level, multiple-volume workbook series, used by many districts in their remedial programs. A page-by-page analysis of these materials provides an account of skills commonly taught, which are described below. A draft of a curriculum guide distributed this summer to all teachers of remedial English classes in one district serves as the other source of information on skills taught, a description of which follows analysis of the texts.

Books used in remedial instruction in junior highs are typically designated in introductory comments in the books themselves or in listings in El-Hi Textbooks in Print (Bowker, 1979) as appropriate for students in junior high and high school or, alternately, in grades 7-12. In practice, it looks like the entire series of one text is used primarily within junior high schools and only occasionally in high schools (Rally!), while other series are used all across the junior high and high school grades, with any particular level text having little to do with school grade level. In other words, most of the books can be found anywhere in post-elementary remedial instruction. There is no way to determine exactly how many classes are using a particular level text at a particular grade level, short of interviewing the teacher of each class using the text. What we've done instead is talk with a sample of teachers, district level curriculum specialists and administrators, and representatives from the publisher of each textbook series we examined. Commonly, their response confirmed our observations. Moreover, our page-by-page analysis of content showed that the emphasis of instruction is fairly common among the texts, with a few exceptions. On the next few pages will be a brief description of the materials, then a discussion of areas of common emphasis.

The Rally! series consists of three levels of materials, each level representing a year of instruction. According to a sales representative, the activities and reading selections are designed for students reading at levels 2.5-3.5 (Level A), 3.5-4.5 (Level B), and 4.5-5.5 (Level C). No suggested grade level is designated for any volume of the series. The core of each level is a set of four paperback readers with corresponding workbooks. Other materials are available, such as audio cassettes and tests.

The Signal series is widely-used in both junior high and high school remedial instruction. Three levels of the six-level series have designated reading levels 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0, respectively (though a quick analysis of estimated readability we performed raised some questions about the designated reading levels). Each level has two anthologies with comment and activity sections following each literature selection, and a teacher's guidebook, which includes instructional strategies, descriptions of skills and subskills, glossary words, and background information.

Another six-book series is Impact on Reading, which, according to the publisher, is designed to promote three years of reading growth in two years of instruction and is intended for students who are two to three years below expected grade level in reading. Each level of the series includes a student text, which is comprised of reading selections, "motivational" and discussion questions, and practice exercises. Each level also has a teacher's guide, which contains instructional objectives, strategies, resources for instruction, answers to the exercises and discussion questions of the student text, unit tests, and worksheets for survival skills (applications, forms, letters, etc.) that can be duplicated.

Vistas is a textbook series designed for middle school or high school students who are reading at the fourth-, fifth-, or sixth-grade reading level. Two anthologies are written at each of the three reading levels, with a Teacher's Guide, workbook, and set of duplicating masters for assessment for each anthology. Not all exercises in the workbook are

noted in the Teacher's Guide; in analyzing activities, we considered such activities outside the core of instruction and thus did not include them in the analysis. Consistent with our analysis of skills taught in other series, we also excluded activities designated as "Pre-reading" (before the lesson) or in other ways indicated as likely to be optional in use among teachers. Vistas is unlike the other series we looked at, in that virtually all of the instruction that would be classified under major skill areas Word Comprehension and Location/Study seemed to be treated as either supplementary or optional activities.

Essential Reading Skills is a different sort of series for remedial instruction. Rather than a sequenced set of texts that teach the same skills, this series is comprised of four workbooks, each focusing on one or more major skill areas: Vocabulary Development (Structural Analysis, Word Comprehension, and Location/Study), Comprehension (Text Comprehension and Literary Elements), Study and Research Skills (Location/Study), and Literary Appreciation (Literary Elements). All of the books in the series are written at a reading level of 5.0 to 6.0, but are aimed at students in grades 7-12. The workbooks look different from the kind that typically accompany basal readers; these workbooks include substantial portions of instruction, i.e., explanations of the skills and procedures for learning them. This series differs from the others described here in another way: there are no selections to read other than paragraphs or very brief articles (the longest is half a page).

Our examination of these sets of materials provides a basis for comment regarding the scope of skills taught in the materials generally. Examining the data for the major skill areas, we note some characteristics of the one series used primarily in junior highs (Rally!) that bind this series a little closer than the others to elementary-school instruction. Phonetic Analysis (sounds represented by letters) and Structural Analysis (parts of words) receive emphasis only in this series (13.0 and 14.0 percent, respectively) and not in others. Rally! also presents far less instruction in Literary Elements (e.g., recognizing the setting of a story) than the other series (2.4 percent vs. a mean of 17.6 percent).

Comparing the skills emphasized in the Rally! series with the emphases of popular elementary reading series, it's not surprising to note many similarities, particularly when we look at skills taught in the fifth and sixth grades. At the upper end of elementary school, instruction favors word comprehension in context; comprehension of sequence, cause and effect, and central theme and details from text; following written directions; making inferences and drawing conclusions from text; using graphic aids; and reading large units of text (sustained reading). Fifth- and sixth-grade textbooks, however, hardly ever include instruction in phonetic analysis. Giving seventh-grade students practice exercises in discriminating and identifying phonemes (i.e., decoding) is unlikely to be the most efficient way to use instructional time. In the elementary school, phonetic analysis has been such a large part of reading instruction that students would have been taught these skills if they came to school at all. Giving the same instruction again to students who read poorly in junior high school makes no more sense than continuing to prescribe medication that hasn't helped a patient after six years. The fact that the Rally! series is not used much past junior high school is consistent with some of the content of skills it teaches.

Looking across all the series, three major skill areas account for the bulk of instruction: Text Comprehension (including categories such as Sequence/Following Directions, Inference/Conclusions/Cause and Effect, and Central Theme, Details), Literary Elements, and Sustained Reading. Though instruction occasionally focuses moderately to greatly on some of the other major skill areas (namely, Word Comprehension and Location/Study [e.g., using a dictionary, or planning a strategy for studying a chapter of a book]), the core of post-elementary remedial instruction (78 percent) falls under the trio of Text Comprehension, Literary Elements, and Sustained Reading. Moreover, when we examine the breakdown of major skill areas into categories, only three account for over 50 percent of all instruction: under Text Comprehension, 18 percent falls under the category Inference/Conclusions/Cause and Effect, and 15 percent comes under Central Theme, Details; and 21 percent of instruction is accounted for by Sustained

Reading, which, without any useful breakdown of skills, is both a major skill area and a skill category. Within Literary Elements, skill categories are more evenly represented, with a range of 0.1 percent for Language's Development (e.g., understanding the role of slang) to 7 percent for Elements of Narrative Structure. These data underscore some features that describe the heart of remedial reading instruction in junior highs (and, as will be shown in Part II, also in high schools): 1) reading a selection longer than a paragraph represents at least one out of every five instructional activities (sustained reading); 2) instruction in interpreting elements of literature, a traditional component of the post-elementary regular English program, takes up nearly another fifth of remedial reading instruction (literary elements); and 3) 40 percent of instruction deals with organizing written discourse in a logical way, in other words, sizing it up (text comprehension).

Many teachers follow closely the instructional plan that is detailed in the teacher's manual of a text series, and that is why we've analyzed the texts here; but others do not, opting instead for a variety of materials and methods which may include portions of the texts. Often teachers consult curriculum guides, if these are available, to help them organize their teaching plans. So it is worthwhile for us to look at one such curriculum guide for junior high remediation.

A Guide for Teaching Basic English 7-9, prepared by a large school district in Southern California, details day-by-day lessons for the first four weeks of class, and presents general guidelines and sample activities for the remainder of the year. The flavor of the guide is realism--the recognition and acknowledgment that the number of skills that are teachable within a school year are limited, and that teachers must be selective in planning instructional activities. The following excerpt from the Guide reflects this sense of realism:

> One of the frustrations of the English teacher's sense of accomplishment is having an overwhelming number of skills to teach. This guide is addressing the problem by reducing the number of objectives to be taught. Screen the activities carefully and select only those which will give students instruction and practice in those objectives. (p. 117)

Teachers are referred to a listing of the skills (objectives) and a breakdown of the tasks involved in the accomplishment of each objective. The list of skills taught and tasks building up to those skills is presented in Appendix B.

Assuming that teachers will adhere to the contents of the Guide and that the emphasis on skills taught is synonymous with the time allocated for those skills, the weekly schedule displayed on page 9, shows the percent of instructional time spent each week on each skill in English to look something like this:

Listening	8%
Speaking (oral)	12%
Reading (literature)*	28%
Writing (journal, spelling, structured writing, and language study)	52%

Clearly, writing has top priority and listening lowest. In practice, instruction in listening is likely to fall by the wayside when full class time isn't available.

Materials. Responses to our inquiry into materials used in remedial reading and English instruction ranged from "All students in grades seven and eight use Language for Meaning" (a developmental, not remedial series), from a reading resource teacher, to "We give them a ream of paper and some pens," from a county consultant for reading and English. In between these points is a wide variety of materials used flexibly in instruction. For example, textbook series intended for the student who has achieved less

*A note on the schedule says that if a student is taking a reading class along with Basic English, the time for literature may be reduced slightly. Recommendations for replacement skills are not given.

than grade-level expectations are used widely in the junior highs; but sometimes these represent all or the core of instruction. In other applications, these series are used as supplements; for instance, where a particular exercise or extra practice is sought.

A fairly new entry in the field of materials for junior high remediation is the instructional companion to a test that previews a district's high school graduation proficiency test. Some school districts have prepared their own criterion-referenced tests and sample teaching activities that correspond to these criteria. Some teachers base their remedial program around student- or teacher-selected trade books, newspapers and magazines, and reference books such as encyclopedias.

It will take time for the materials used in junior high remediation to become as well-established as those in elementary school. We can identify the materials used at present, recognizing that change in the listing is likely. Almost all of these materials are also used in high school remedial instruction, so we've pulled together a list of materials used in post-elementary remedial reading and English instruction (Appendix C). Information on intended grade and reading level are based upon promotional literature, El-Hi Textbooks in Print (Bowker, 1979), or introductory comments in the materials. Caution should be exercised in interpreting these data, because grade or reading levels at best are only suggestions or rough estimates of suitability for a student. Many other factors are involved, such as a student's interests, instructional use (for example, independent vs. teacher-guided reading), and so on. The classification of these materials is also roomy, because individual teachers may use texts, kits, etc. in novel ways; for example, workbook pages from a textbook series used in a learning center or teacher-made game.

General methods. Methods of teaching remedial reading and English in the junior high seem to resemble methods of instruction in elementary school more than they do teaching methods in regular high school classes

or upper grades of junior high schools. Small group instruction and varied and brief independent activities are common. Teachers demonstrate concepts with visual devices such as transparencies, charts, sentence strips, flash cards, and audio tapes. Instruction by lecture is discouraged. Teachers trained to work in elementary school have an advantage here over teachers trained in a high school subject, although more and more we see secondary education majors required to take at least one course in teaching methods.

With the realization that many students who need remedial teaching in junior high do not function well (learn much) when taught by traditional methods, some school districts are conducting demonstration lessons, developing and airing videotaped presentations, and distributing printed guides to train teachers in effective instructional methodology.

PART II: HIGH SCHOOLS

OVERVIEW OF PRACTICES IN HIGH SCHOOL REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION

High school instruction tailored specifically for students with inadequate reading proficiency has been something of a tradition for forty years, and a few large-scale remedial programs in public high schools were begun even earlier; however, the scope of remediation, and occasionally its structure, is changing largely in response to two stimuli: 1) widespread concern that growing numbers of youth are entering the job market underprepared for employment, and 2) legislation that addresses proficiency in basic literacy skills. But in contrast to instruction in junior high schools, which is neither stable nor uniform, high school remedial programs, at least in the Southwest, are now practically synchronized in moving toward a common goal, give or take a year or two, across districts, schools, and even grades. And that common goal is a demonstration that students have achieved "minimum competency" in the basic skills by the time they reach the end of the twelfth year in high school.

Without dwelling too long on the history of remedial reading instruction in the high schools (remedial English at this writing is still a newcomer), an overview can shed light on the emergence of a well-established structure for delivering remedial instruction and the concomitant role of structure as an agent for wholesale adjustment of scope.

A survey by Blair (1941) indicated that more than fifty percent of the high schools provided special classes for weak readers. another ten percent gave remedial instruction within regular English classes. about seven percent had specialists who worked with individuals or small groups, and seven percent of the schools gave teachers of other classes the responsibility for remedial reading instruction. After World War II, as a response to public awareness of the high rates of illiteracy among draftees, the armed services developed a program of remedial teaching. The apparent efficiency of the program gave impetus to the spread of

remedial instruction outside the military, and the training of reading teachers under the GI bill provided the means for instruction. Remedial reading instruction at all levels, including the high schools, was further stimulated in the 1950's by fears that communism would spread and by the development of Soviet nuclear arms; during this period government grants stimulated effort in teaching reading in the content areas (e.g., science and social studies). Then in the sixties and seventies, remedial instruction in the high schools grew dramatically as a direct result of special funding for both teacher-training and other aspects of instruction through the National Defense Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The historical sketch indicates that a common structure of remedial reading instruction in the high schools has been established over time, growing from the same origins, with a common programmatic and financial evolution. What this shared background means is that high school remedial reading instruction has moved pretty much as a singular body whose bulk and momentum has probably kept and still keeps most programs of instruction on the same course, at least in terms of structure.

The scope of high school remedial instruction traditionally has loosely followed an academic model or an image of the graduate as college-bound. This is not to say teachers have <u>believed</u> that most of the students receiving remedial instruction would actually enter and stay in college, but rather that the skills taught to these high school students has focused on the traditional upper-grade elementary-school reading curriculum, on study skills, and on formal English. Few programs of remedial instruction, up to recently, provided students with reading and writing skills applicable directly to practical situations, such as beginning a job. Remedial instruction in the high school operates in dim light of what skills students must have to function acceptably in such situations. Schools may know a lot about reading and writing instruction, but most do not have much knowledge of what skills employers and job trainers are looking for.

The skills currently taught in remedial programs in the high schools vary somewhat from district to district but not very much within a single school district. District-wide graduation requirements (i.e., minimum competency tests) pretty much govern what is to be taught. But there are common focuses of instruction that go beyond district lines, and these are apparent when we look at the materials used in instruction.

STRUCTURE OF HIGH SCHOOL REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION

Student population. High school students who receive remedial instruction are often veterans of other programs of remediation. While students' deficits in other areas of elementary or junior high school instruction may have gone unnoticed, at least in the days before minimum competency testing in basic skills, a deficiency in reading was usually apparent for several reasons: reading skills are almost always an integral part of routine testing in the schools; opportunities for informal assessment in reading are plentiful since reading instruction is hardly ever bypassed in day-to-day instruction; and since graded reading textbooks are the vehicles used most often for delivering instruction, at least up to junior high school, deficits can be roughly estimated according to textbook calibrations. What this means is that in reading, at least, serious difficulties (often defined as "at least two levels below expectations") are likely to have come to the attention of school personnel by the time a student entered high school. And if elementary or junior high schools developed and implemented any sort of remedial program, reading was typically considered first--reading traditionally has had the most trained staff and the largest funding commitment. Once students have been taught in a remedial reading program, chances are great they have continued to follow a remedial "track" into high school. The story goes something like this: students are at least two grades behind in scores on a standardized reading test or subtest; instruction is begun at the level at which they score and proceeds according to a standard sequence; at the end of remediation students have gained in reading proficiency, but their test scores are still at least two levels or more behind other students. So a program of remedial instruction is prescribed again, but at a higher level of schooling.

Now, with the group of students who have been placed in perpetual remediation, we can identify some others receiving remedial instruction in high school. First let's consider those high schoolers who may have slipped by in elementary or junior high school but are now caught by failure to achieve a passing score on minimum competency tests administered in Grade 9 or 10. This group includes students who may have been

excluded from remedial instruction for various reasons, including lack of test data (e.g., because of absenteeism, inexperienced teaching, or understaffed or dissimilar schooling) or unavailability of remedial instruction (often because schools have too few students having difficulty to make fully-developed programs of remediation practical or too many to include all students who may need a special curriculum). Other students who receive remedial instruction in high school may have demonstrated adequate proficiency in reading but scored below a passing grade on a test for writing, a subject area that has not received much emphasis in pre-high school instruction until very recently.

The picture that emerges from looking at students who receive remedial instruction in the high schools today is not the portrait of a single teenager; it is instead a group photograph. We see a young man who in the fourth grade began to be a "won't" reader rather than a "can't" reader, and whose reading skills were fixated at that level. Because so many students in his elementary and junior high school were non-readers or severely deficient readers, and his classroom behavior was not disruptive and so did not draw attention, the limited amount of special learning assistance available in the school never reached this young man. Next to him is a young woman who in the early grades had some mild weaknesses in her reading, which were compounded as the curriculum became crowded with more and more skills in later grades; and the distance between her reading proficiency and grade level expectations lengthened in junior high school as she became a chronic truant. There is also the teenager who had great difficulty learning to read and write as far back as the first grade. Always placed in the "slow" class, always given supplementary instruction in a pull-out lab, she began and ended each grade with word analysis exercises (in various forms such as workbooks, kits, and games) which she never really understood. And there never seemed to be enough time for writing instruction, other than handwriting and spelling. By the time she entered high school, her learning difficulties were magnified by substance abuse. Another student receiving remedial instruction never heard English spoken until he came to this country when he was

thirteen. In addition to the language demands of high school, he struggled with cultural displacement. There's also the youth who attended many, many different schools, but was absent for long periods as his family followed seasonal farming opportunities; he was often out of school when reading tests were administered, and the spotty information available on his achievement was usually slow in reading each new school. Just about as soon as a decision was made to provide some sort of catch-up instruction in one school, he was gone again. Finally we see several students who seemed to be achieving in school approximately according to an expected schedule, but they were tripped by an eighth-grade test that included a number of items that assessed some skills not emphasized in their elementary and junior high reading and other language arts instruction.

The foregoing depictions are not melodrama; the students described here attend school in most large and many smaller districts. They are included here to make a point. At age fourteen or fifteen, students have accumulated diverse experiences, both in and out of school, that determine their demonstrated proficiencies in basic literacy skills. Moreover, those who receive remedial instruction, as a group, are probably more unlike each other than their more proficient peers. For example, the range of serious skill deficits among high schoolers spans up to about twelve grade levels. Some students have a few gaps or weaknesses in reading or writing skills, while others may be entirely illiterate. Still other students may be conversant in one or more languages, but unable to communicate in English, which is a genuine problem when other high school classes are conducted solely in English. If we consider experiences amassed by individual students, either detrimental or complementary to learning in the remedial classroom, we can add such things as time spent in correctional facilities, emotional disorders, part-time employment, participation in sports, religious and family responsibilities, and on and on, each of which may have bearing on the success of remedial instruction for a particular student.

Entry and termination skills. When remedial practices in junior high schools were described in Part I of this report, the heading was separated into 1) entry skills and 2) termination skills. For junior highs, practices detailed under each of those headings were sufficiently distinct to warrant two sections. But at the high school level students' skills as they enter a program of remedial instruction and the skills they have in place when they leave it are for the most part defined by the same criterion: a test of basic skills. As a matter of fact, the test of choice in a district is beginning to draw a practically closed circuit around remedial instruction in its high schools. Here's the way the circuit flows: students take a test soon after they enter high school; if they fail the test, they are given remedial instruction on those skills in which the test indicated a deficiency; such instruction is terminated when they pass another form of the same test (or if they drop out of school). I've emphasized the word "when" because students are usually tested in the ninth grade and then have many, many opportunities to be retested, including special summer test administrations following intensive practice designed to teach the skills assessed by the part or parts of the test students failed. Few students who remain in school have still not passed the test by the end of the summer that follows their expected graduation. What all of this means, at least for the present time, is that high school minimum competency tests are beginning to indicate the curriculum of remedial instruction and not the other way around.

This does not mean that no other remedial instruction exists at the high school level. Programs do exist that go beyond minimal basic skills; after all, the graduation requirements in most school districts are geared to the proficiencies expected of a ninth-grader, and that leaves about three years of skill growth for students passing the test as well as for students who don't pass. But generally instruction "beyond minimal" takes a back seat to "below minimal," and only exists when resources, largely funded for trained staff and materials, are bountiful. When it comes to a choice between spending money to avoid being threatened with

a lawsuit (i.e., having students who fail to graduate and who claim that their instruction did not prepare them adequately) and spending money to provide remediation beyond minimal skills, districts have no real choice.

While junior high schools by and large project an image of the student at the completion of remedial instruction as rejoining the ranks of the college-bound, high schools are less naive but maybe more schizophrenic. On the one hand, high schools now have (or are in the process of refining) fairly well-defined goals for students who wish to graduate, that is to be able to demonstrate minimum competencies, which include some "academic" skills (e.g., identifying a part of speech), and "coping-with-life" skills (e.g., interpreting a garment label). This situation, while more realistic than when remediation focused solely on academic skills, is a compromise that maintains whatever image of the graduate the community currently favors. On the other hand, high schools in general haven't really addressed the problem of underprepared youth who do not plan on finishing high school.

Probably the best way to describe the competencies high school students have as they begin and leave a program of remedial instruction in reading or English is to first present a brief sketch of how a few districts in our region structure remediation, and then detail the skills assessed by the minimum competency tests they administer.

One populous high school district in Southern California (which includes junior highs) identifies students for remedial instruction in high school on the basis of a series of four criterion-referenced tests in reading, language (English), mathematics, and composition (writing sample). Developed by the district, the tests are used to fulfill legislatively-mandated graduation requirements. Students are administered a grade-level version of the test in grade 7, 8, 9, and 10. Each grade-level version includes items representing a slightly different mix of skill areas which combined indicate a sequence of skill development; however, the tenth-grade test is the one students must pass for graduation.

Results of each test administration are used by regular English teachers to plan instruction. If students do not pass the tenth-grade test, which is administered in March, they may attend summer school, where they receive instruction in the skills assessed by the items they answered incorrectly. Parents can also purchase at nominal cost a "remediation kit" developed by the district. At this time, too, a list of tutors is made available to parents. Students can be retested with another form of the test during that summer, but if they are still unsuccessful, they have an opportunity to take other forms in November and March of the eleventh grade, and again during the following summer. A student who still fails the test has another chance in November of the twelfth grade, then another in March, and again in May. While students are routinely given remedial instruction in their regular English classrooms, an option is made available to twelfth-graders who do not pass the test in March: at a conference held with the teacher, parents, and school counselor, parents can agree to allow their child to attend a special class in reading or English, depending upon which skills need to be mastered.

At a large unified school district, also in Southern California, students are "tracked" in junior high and high school English classes on the basis of a registration system whereby sixth-grade teachers identify students as Basic (weak in basic skills), Intermediate (average), or Advanced (strong). In junior high school, students are administered individual subtests of the graduation proficiency test and by this means can accumulate passing credits for parts of the test, which do not require repetition once passed. Subtests remaining to be passed are administered to Advanced students in the seventh-grade, who are then assigned to enrichment English classes if they pass. Intermediate students may take all needed subtests in the eighth grade, and then are assigned to a regular program of English instruction. Ninth-grade Basic students are administered all remaining subtests, and if all subtests are passed they go on to a somewhat slower-paced program of English instruction. If at the start of high school, students have not yet passed all parts of the graduation proficiency test, they have two options. One is to stay in

the Basic track for one semester of high school and be given another opportunity to pass the test. This option is usually restricted to those students who narrowly missed passing a subtest or perhaps two. This option avoids the stigma associated with the second option. If students have not passed all subtests they may be placed in a "competency class," established to help students meet their test demands; students participate in this class for as long as they need to pass all subtests, which are administered every semester. This district also has a summer program for instruction in competency skills. Once students pass the test, reading instruction is no longer required. But a two-semester composition course is taken by all students in the sophomore year in conjunction with a writing sample which must be judged acceptable to meet.

Surveying teachers and administrators in several other school districts, it became obvious that skills upon entry and termination everywhere are determined in about the same way, and the structure of the curriculum beween those two points is about the same. Differences do exist in the number of tracks designated for English instruction, in the tests developed or selected by districts to meet legal requirements, and in a few other aspects of the structure of high school remedial teaching, but these differences are minor. By and large, the programs look pretty much alike, but they differ in a few respects; so the following abbreviated sketches disclose information on dissimilar aspects.

One medium-size school district in Arizona has a three-level (or track) program of reading instruction in their high schools: Applied (remedial), Developmental (continuing to build reading skills), and College-Bound (academic study). Remedial English instruction is handled in slower-paced English classes. Students must achieve the equivalent of a ninth-grade score on the California Achievement Test (CAT) to receive a "standard" high school diploma. (They are awarded an "endorsed" diploma if they also pass the 17 "competencies" measured by a district-developed test--which is quite a bit more difficult, according to an administrator. In addition, special graduation "seals" can be earned by students who

successfully complete more advanced work.) One of the largest school districts in the United States requires that their graduates pass the Senior High Assessment of Reading Performance (SHARP, CTB/McGraw-Hill). Students are usually administered the SHARP no later than the tenth grade, and if they do not pass it, they attend special classes where SHARP Competency Kits are the basis of remedial instruction. Other editions of the SHARP are administered until a passing score is reached. A district in Nevada administers its own Secondary Remedial Reading Criterion Referenced Test as a high school graduation requirement. The Writing Test of the Nevada State Competency Test is their sole criterion for meeting graduation English requirements; it consists of two writing samples, a letter and an essay. A medium-size suburban high school district in California uses the SHARP for reading, the Test of Everyday Writing Skills (TEWS, CTB/McGraw-Hill) for English, and a writing sample. Another unified school district in California has proposed testing procedures that are built upon district-developed elementary and middle school criterion-referenced tests and which correspond closely to higher grade levels of its existing curriculum.

Now that we have profiled the practices of a few school districts for identifying candidates for remedial instruction in high school, let's look at what skills are assessed. To approximate a consistent analysis, each item on tests used by the districts we surveyed was fitted to a framework SWRL developed for analyzing reading textbook series. In some cases the framework was expanded slightly to accommodate all skill categories, especially those traditionally included in a language arts or English framework. Considering that the distinction between reading skills and language arts or English skills is blurred in remedial instruction at the high school level and that the same skills are categorized in curriculum lists under "Reading" for some districts and under "Language" or "English" for others, the merger for test analysis seems appropriate. A table of skills assessed by objective tests is in Appendix D. A description of writing samples follows in Appendix E.

Examining the table we can see that a few skill categories are commonly assessed by school districts. Interpreting abbreviations is one, and analyzing word roots and affixes (e.g., prefixes and suffixes) is another. Each test except for the two devoted entirely to writing skills (Write: Senior High and TEWS) emphasizes the comprehension of words in context (e.g., in a story or article). And recognizing the part-of-speech of a word (syntax) is a focus of instruction. When we look at the categories listed under Text Comprehension, central theme (e.g., main idea) and supporting details is solid across districts. Identifying the style and type of writing (e.g., propaganda, fact vs. opinion) is a commonly-assessed skill category under Literary Elements. And all districts assess students' knowledge of dictionaries or glossaries, other reference sources (e.g., library card catalogue), and graphic aids (e.g., maps). Unlike assessments for the elementary grades, high school competency tests do not generally include questions about Phonetic Analysis, with the exception of the C County (Nevada) test.

The format of items on both district-developed and published objective tests is essentially the same--a direction or question and a set of answer choices (usually four). English tests lean heavily towards items that require students to identify a sentence in which a particular element (e.g., spelling of a word, inflection in a word) is incorrect and the others are right or, alternatively, to identify the correct one among wrong answer choices. Reading tests also have some items of this type but tend to present some kind of written stimulus with an item based upon it (e.g., a paragraph with a direction or question to identify an unstated main idea). (The SHARP and Write: Senior High are a little different from the other tests; these two present displays, such as applications and product labels, as written stimuli for all items.) The criterion for passing a test or a part of a test is usually determined by the school district, and hovers around 70 percent.

Writing samples are required by most districts to assess writing proficiency. The brief sketches presented in Appendix E provide a picture

of the variety of tasks and scoring procedures used by several districts and one published test that is used in many districts. By and large, the samples consist of one or two single paragraphs. Moreover, we understand from teachers in the districts involved, single-paragraph responses to test directions asking for essays or letters may be judged satisfactory if other criteria are met. In other words, the length of writing sample that would be needed to develop an idea fully is not required--a paragraph suffices.

Time. Secondary level teachers, as a group, seem to be keenly aware of time available for instruction. At this level, instruction has always been segmented into units or credits which translate into hours of instruction with definite ending points. By contrast, elementary level teachers for many years were responsible for a single class for all of or for a large part of the school day; they could bend the time limits for instruction in a particular subject area if they needed to. For example, if a student didn't understand a concept taught during the period reserved for mathematics, the teacher could provide some additional help (remedial instruction) while other students were finishing up say their book reports. If the student who received special help didn't complete her book report, the teacher could squeeze it into time set aside for another activity or have the student work on it at home. The result was that much remediation in the elementary school has been achieved within the structure of regular instruction. The same thing happened when students were absent from school; they could receive catch-up instruction during regular school hours, or they might be tutored a bit immediately after school.

Even when students have been "pulled-out" by a "resource teacher" for remedial instruction, the resource teacher generally worked with the regular classroom teacher to coordinate their instruction. And most of the time the resource teacher's schedule determined when students left their regular classrooms for special instruction; classroom teachers tended to accommodate remediation, either by shifting their schedule of instruction or by bending an in-place schedule to make time for these students.

In response to legislation that requires demonstration of minimum competencies in the basic literacy skills, high schools have made time for remediation while maintaining the realism, formality, and cohesion that have marked their instructional practices. First, remedial instruction had to be provided during regular school hours, and students had to have ample opportunity to develop and demonstrate competencies within the three or four years they attended high school (states include these stipulations in their legislation). Second, special instruction had to be planned just for students who had demonstrated weaknesses in tested skill areas. And then remedial instruction had to fit into all of the other instructional offerings of the high school. Translated into practice, this response has meant a low-level track for English instruction (which often includes reading), a separate reading class (which has meant that an elective, a study hall, service, or other class is forfeited), and time out from classes for frequent testing. Remember that momentum we discussed in relation to the way the high schools have moved as a body? Well, we see it now in the allowances made for mandated remedial instruction. We also see it as high schools, in general, continue to teach students in other subjects as if they could read, write, and compute as well as could be expected for their grade level. By and large, high school departments other than English (which often includes reading) and mathematics, and occasionally reading as a separate department, ignore the functional limitations of their students and sometimes use textbooks their students can't understand, vocabulary they never heard of, and writing and computing tasks their students can't do. The image of the high school graduate as ready for college or skilled employment is maintained by many educators. To them, departmental time is also territorial time and as such is highly resistant to perceived (non-mandated) intrusion.

Facilities. In high school, there are no corners of the classroom for remedial instruction. Keeping with the realism and formality of high school remedial instruction, classrooms are assigned definite functions; either they are set aside as rooms for remedial instruction, and look like learning labs or clinics (especially in reading or writing) with

comfortable, small groupings of furniture, or they are used for low-track instruction (especially in English), where they look like any other academic classroom in a high school. The rooms outfitted as labs are generally used only for remedial instruction, while the other rooms may shift to and from regular instruction with each class period. In either case during any class period, a room for remediation is a room for remediation, and nothing else; in the high school today, remedial instruction is a "discipline" in its own right.

Staff. Traditionally, staff has had a great deal of influence on the curriculum of the high school. Where staff were available who were trained in remedial reading, there were apt to be reading classes. Where no staff were trained in reading, students who read poorly were generally assigned to slow-paced English classes, and severely-disabled readers were taught reading also by English teachers. Now, a fair number of English and other subject trained teachers in the high school have attended graduate programs for special training in secondary reading, but to meet the staffing requirements of mandated remedial reading instruction, high schools generally assign whatever teachers they can get for these positions. What we're seeing in the high schools today is some influence of staff on curriculum (it is a committee of staff in most districts who specify the content of district-developed graduation competency tests, and so it is staff indirectly who specify the remedial curriculum), and some influence of curriculum upon staff (mandated competencies can convert an English or history teacher into a remedial reading teacher, especially when a depressed budget dictates a freeze on new hires). If we're talking about remedial English instruction in the high schools, then we're almost always talking about English teachers.

The question of whether a remedial reading teacher's training background is in reading or English, or some other subject, may sound like a trivial one. But it may not be. A view expressed often in professional organizations of English teachers is that reading teachers or

specialists tend to omit whole-language and process-centered learning activities and instead tend to center instruction around practicing isolated skills in abbreviated, contrived materials, plus encouraging students to read more. Around organizations of reading teachers the popular image is that of English teachers tending to focus on formal grammar and other esoteric studies. These stereotypes may not be accurate, but if teachers think they're true, then we would expect 1) distrust among the staff in a high school, 2) maintenance of territoriality, and 3) isolated and overlapping approaches to remedial instruction. To some degree all three expectations are indeed facts.

Some school districts have embarked upon fairly elaborate projects to increase the effectiveness of their staff through inservice practices. For example, one high school district is presently committed to a five-year program of staff development that invovles matching funds from the federal government. Each year a different group of 250 teachers from the district attends their Staff Development Center and works with teacher trainers in writing skills, learning styles, and many other areas of teaching. When the program is over, it is planned, all district teachers, no matter what their discipline, will have participated. Another high school district has a writing program for all students, from basic skills to advanced student writers, that was instituted within the district and later funded through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, IV C. The writing program, begun as a cooperative effort with a university professor, stresses the use of student workshops and labs for teaching components of the writing process, including pre-writing, writing, revising, and editing. An integral part of this program is a series of seminars for implementing the program, which district teachers have the option of attending.

"Wonder" programs. A description of remedial practices in the high schools would be inadequate without mention of the group of maverick, "wonder" programs reported at conferences and in publications for educators; and I'm describing these kinds of programs here because it is their

structure rather than content that sets them apart from other programs of remedial instruction. Generally the "wonder" programs are purported to raise the accomplishments of a group of low-achieving students up to an extraordinarily high level within a short period of time. The claims often sound too good to be true, hence the appellation "wonder"; but teachers who have tried other strategies of instruction without much success are willing to listen, to read, and to try what they perceive to be a potential remedy.

The wonder programs, in general, share certain characteristics. Most of them have an unusually high ratio of teachers or paraprofessionals to students, for example, 1:3. Most are offered to students as an option, but with high school course credit given. The criterion for entry into a program is typically a standardized achievement survey or reading test, e.g., Metropolitan Achievement, California Achievement, Stanford Achievement, and Gates-MacGinitie Reading; but teacher-made tests are also used. Most of the time school counselors are primary or at least supportive agents in identifying candidates for the program. Finally, materials used for instruction are varied, and tend to be used not as a comprehensive package of instruction but rather as resources for practice exercises. I'm inclined to think that wonder programs in high schools are on the decline as the special funding that often supports these programs is disappearing. Moreover, as proficiency testing in basic skills is becoming more formalized in the elementary schools and junior highs, I would expect fewer deficient readers and writers to slip through to high school. And it's the really tough cases of non-literates who traditionally have been served the most by wonder programs. It will be interesting to learn the fate of these programs.

SCOPE OF HIGH SCHOOL REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION

Skills taught. It is inaccurate to say that the skills taught in remedial classes in the high schools right now are dictated by graduation tests, but they are certainly leaning in that direction. In some districts, the tests do direct instruction, but the tests do not originate from nowhere. Someone or some group in a school district either chose an existing instrument presumably on the basis of skills assessed by it, or else specified the nature of one they would develop. Sometimes the two options were exercised in a blend; for example, several school districts modeled sections of their homemade tests after existing published instruments.

We don't know what portion of a district's test selection decision can be attributed to the skills reflected in a chosen test. After all, districts had to come up with an instrument--and quickly; and school funding has not been very generous recently in terms of additional staff time (money) for test-making. So it's not unreasonable to surmise that readily available tests or skills lists from publishers' scope-and-sequence charts and other handy sources contributed considerably to test selection or development decisions. This situation is not necessarily evil if the skills assessed conform to the district's projected image of the student at graduation. But if a district has only a cloudy notion of what skills they think are essential for the graduate to function in a literate society or the test does not assess the skills that support a well-defined projection of the graduate, then administration of the chosen assessment may be at best an empty exercise in back-to-basics hoopla and at worst a fraud to the student and the community.

Looking at the skills taught in remedial reading or English classes, we can reconstruct the image projected of the student at graduation, regardless of whether that image is by design or accident. The profile is drawn from the curriculum guides, textbooks, learning kits, and other materials, which are often specified by minimum competency tests. For

example, the SHARP, administered by several districts and used as a model for homemade criterion-referenced tests in other districts, has companion instructional materials, i.e., the EDL SHARP Competency Kit, which forms the core of remedial reading instruction in those districts. One high school district, as another example, developed both a Reading and an English Remediation Learning Kit and a Reading and Language (English) Sequential Continuum Task Analysis to accompany their Graduation Requirement Tests for Reading and Language.

Classes for remedial instruction in the high schools generally use a variety of materials, though one textbook series or learning kit sometimes forms the core of instruction with supplementary materials used to provide emphasis on skills that are underrepresented or not taught in core materials or are particularly troublesome for students to learn, i.e., require additional instruction. Looking at the skills taught in these materials allows us to draw a picture of high school remedial instruction, though the picture becomes narrower when a district requires that its own test-based curriculum be taught. The core materials analyzed to describe high school remedial instruction include the textbook series, Signal (Scott, Foresman), Impact on Reading (Holt, Rinehart and Winston), Vistas (Houghton Mifflin), and Essential Reading Skills (McDougal, Littell); and a single-volume text, English for Everyday Living (Incentives for Learning).

The content of core materials used in remedial instruction in the junior highs was analyzed and described in Part I of this report. Of the five textbook series we examined, one was found to be confined almost always to junior high classes (Rally!), while the others were used in the high schools as well. A single-volume textbook, English for Everyday Living (Incentives for Learning), is also used to teach remedial reading and English in many school districts, but usually only in the high schools. To examine high school remediation separately, we simply omitted the Rally! series, and included English for Everyday Living.

English for Everyday Living is unlike the textbook series in both appearance and content. It is a single-volume worktext divided into 17 chapters, each of which focuses on either a major skill area (e.g., phonetic analysis) or interpreting a type of written communication (e.g., the newspaper). Typically, each skill taught is introduced with a brief explanation and followed by a practice exercise. Instruction in a skill is offered once and does not follow a developmental sequence. The content of English for Everyday Living can be described as a little of everything, except for skills classified as Pre-Reading. Unlike the series, it includes some instruction in Oral Language (about 1 percent), all of it categorized as Public Speaking (e.g., parliamentary procedure). The three major emphases of instruction identified in junior high school textbooks and in senior high textbooks as a group, that is Text Comprehension, Literary Elements, and Sustained Reading, are not apparent in this text. In fact, only about 3 percent of instruction here is reading selections longer than a paragraph or two, compared to an average of about 19 percent for the other textbooks used in high schools. On the other hand, English for Everyday Living gives moderate emphasis to skills in Structural Analysis (10 percent), Word Comprehension (19 percent), Location/Study (22 percent), and Discourse Construction (e.g., describing observations) (14 percent). This text is fairly representative of other single-volume, comprehensive books for high school remedial reading instruction. Constrained by page space, they tend to present brief instruction in a wide-range of skills. These compact programs of instruction can be used where students spend a limited amount of classroom time to catch up a bit where they have weaknesses or have had gaps in learning the skills. It is doubtful that such single-volume texts can provide enough instruction for readers whose accomplishments are far behind their peers.

All in all, the content of textbooks used for remedial instruction in the high schools is about the same as in the junior highs, which is no surprise since much of the same materials are used at both levels. The important point is that although textbooks may vary in the emphasis they

give to some areas of instruction, a core of concentrated instruction is identifiable almost everywhere.

With textbooks, it is relatively easy to determine how much instructional emphasis is placed on various skills; but unless a curriculum guide (continuum, course syllabus, or what have you) specifies time allotments for teaching those skills (as one district did in their junior highs), it's hard to know how much time is reserved for each skill or major skill area, in other words how much each is stressed in teaching. School districts that base their curriculum upon high school graduation proficiency tests make the job of determining instructional emphasis easier. Most districts rely upon asterisks; typically, curriculum guides indicate which skills are tested--and those become the ones emphasized in instruction. Note below the outline of skills taught in a high school remedial reading course, and look at the asterisks.

COURSE OUTLINE FOR REMEDIAL READING

I. READINESS

- A. Need for Reading (0)
- B. Personal Strengths and Weaknesses (0)

II. LISTENING

- A. Need for Listening (0)
- B. Following Directions
- C. Listening for Literal Comprehension
- D. Listening for Critical Comprehension

III. VOCABULARY

- A. Sight Words (0)
- B. Phonics
- C. Base Words/Prefixes/Suffixes
- D. Contractions
- E. Vocabulary Development
- F. Context
- G. Idioms

(0) Observable Skills, Not Tested on Criterion Referenced Tests

IV. COMPREHENSION

*A. Main Idea
B. Detail
*C. Sequence
*D. Fact/Opinion
*E. Cause and Effect
*F. Inference/Conclusion
G. Oral Reading (O)
H. Reading for Pleasure (O)

V. STUDY SKILLS

*A. Alphabetizing
*B. Dictionary Skills
*C. Following Directions (O)
*D. Book Parts
*E. Reference Skills
*F. Maps, Charts, and Graphs
G. Reading Rate (O)

VI. CAREERS

A. World of Work
B. Basic Life Skills

One district has developed an entire plan of instruction, including day-to-day lessons, practice exercises, and review quizzes--all of it corresponding to items on their test. Wherever a district bases its curriculum on a proficiency test and encourages teachers to follow it (e.g., by attending closely to classroom test performance or packaging the instruction in an easy-to-deliver format), the district transmits a message of what it emphasizes in instruction. And an analysis of the test content displays that emphasis clearly.

A comparison of the content of textbooks and the content of graduation proficiency tests shows an apparent discrepancy in skills emphasized. While the tests, like the textbooks, do focus on skills in the areas of Text Comprehension and Literary Elements (tests do not assess skill in the third major area of emphasis, Sustained Reading),

*Minimum Competency Skills
(O) Observable Skills, Not Tested on Criterion Referenced Tests

they also include a large proportion of items in the area Word Comprehension, especially in Context (e.g., embedded in a sentence), and Location/Study, especially Graphic Aids. And Discourse Construction accounts for many items on tests or subtests devoted entirely to English or language. One reason Word Comprehension may not have shown up as an emphasized major skill area could be that most textbooks include only suggestions for informal teaching of vocabulary prior to having students read a selection. In those cases, the instruction was not considered an integral part of the lesson, and hence was not included in our analysis. Also, more and more districts are teaching functional reading and writing skills (e.g., interpreting graphically presented material such as charts, labels, and maps), which are skills generally included as options or supplements to comprehensive textbooks, but not as cores. Our textbook analysis would have thus excluded these skills as well. An explanation for the difference between tests and textbooks in their focus on Discourse Construction is that our textbook analysis did not include books devoted to English skills, since the ones used in remedial classes tend to be regular, developmental English texts. Accepting these explanations, the focus of skills taught in remedial instruction resembles skills tested, at least in a general way.

Materials. Published materials for remedial reading instruction have been used in the high schools for some time. Generally these materials have been fairly inexpensive softbound workbooks focused on individual skill areas or more comprehensive kits of reusable worksheets or cards, which are divided into skill areas. Sometimes the supplements are anthologies of literature interspersed with practice exercises, which usually emphasize text and word comprehension. Sometimes they are easy-to-read high-interest paperback novels and biographies. Some materials stress study skills. And others center on reading rate, especially mechanical devices such as the tachistoscope (a machine that controls rate by presenting words or lines of writing at an accelerated pace). Typically, classroom teachers have managed the remedial reading classroom eclectically; they've diagnosed students' skills and have prescribed a program of

instruction using parts of a variety of materials to remedy skill deficits. A peek at a traditional remedial reading classroom in a high school a short while ago would have revealed shelves and tables filled with a few copies of many different skinny softbound books with sophisticated cover illustrations (it's no secret that poor readers don't like to read, and the books they <u>really</u> don't like to read are the ones with many pages and hard and childish-looking covers). You'd have also seen learning kits, reading machines, assorted audiovisual equipment (to make reading more palatable), teacher-made or commercially-produced learning games, various reference books (mostly dictionaries), and workbooks, workbooks, workbooks.

Now, though the eclectic approach is still very popular, many teachers use the newly-available comprehensive reading textbook series that are designed expressly for high school students who read poorly, or at least below the ninth-grade level, which is the usual criterion for remedial reading in the high schools. (Virtually no high schools surveyed offer remedial reading instruction to students whose test scores are equivalent to 9.0 or higher, though many schools do offer courses in speed-reading and study skills as electives.) The skills taught by these series were described in the previous section of this report.

For remedial instruction in English, however, materials used are for the most part those designated for the elementary grades or designed for high school developmental English instruction (grade-level skills). A possible explanation for this situation is that except for the study of literature, the regular English curriculum is pretty repetitive from grade to grade. And, apparently, the readability (level of reading difficulty) of the materials for remedial English instruction is not considered very important; otherwise, I would think, this information would be publicized in promotional literature and indexes of school books. If the format used in materials for English instruction leans heavily toward brief, limited-response practice exercises, as it seems to, then readability probably wouldn't matter. Once kids know how to "do" an exercise, that is, are familiar with its format, the written directions

are often superfluous, and students, especially the less proficient ones (the ones who don't like to read), hardly pay attention to them.

From information gained through personal and telephone interviews with teachers, school administrators, and publishers' representatives and through written documents, for example, curriculum guides, and booklists, we can describe what materials are in use in several districts for remedial instruction. Printed materials listed in Appendix C are identified according to designated grade level, reading level, title, classification, and publisher, wherever such information is available. Since the same materials are often used in both reading and English classes, we haven't indicated class use here. Mechanical devices and games are not included in this list, nor are materials prepared by teachers for their own classroom use.

General methods. Methods of teaching remedial reading and English in the high school resemble methods of instruction in regular high school classes, with some exceptions. In a resource room or laboratory set-up, instruction tends to be presented to small groups or individuals in varied, mediated ways: with visual aids, such as charts and transparencies; using non-book materials, for example, cards, packets, kits, and tapes; and through active participation, such as writing, games, and dramatization. For these classes, lectures are discouraged. But the teaching methodology has much to do with the teacher's background. If a teacher has been trained as a reading specialist, it's a good bet that she or he has been taught to work with deficient readers and has become familiar with alternative teaching methods. If, however, a teacher has majored in another area, such as English or history, chances are that instructional methods was not a focus of their professional training, hence traditional one-way (teacher-to-student, read-and-answer questions) instruction is maintained. Faced with large numbers of students enrolled in remedial classes and small numbers of specially-trained teachers, some districts have instituted extensive inservice activities where topics almost always include non-traditional methods of instruction for students who need to catch up in basic skills.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Many students enter junior high school lacking in the most elementary skills of communication, including reading, writing, speaking, and listening. These students face a bleak prospect for pre-vocational training or employment other than for low-paying, futureless, and usually menial work. Society has begun to recognize the burden it will eventually have to carry for these young men and women and the waste of human potential. State law in many areas and local legislation in others have demanded that schools demonstrate they are teaching basic literacy. And the push for basic skills by the time a student graduates from high school is beginning to move down into earlier grades.

Junior highs, especially in large school districts, seem to be stepping quickly if not always methodically towards developing programs of instruction intended to help students catch up at least to minimal standards in achievement. But these programs are still being refined and most often are tentative responses to newly-drafted or recently-adopted high school graduation tests. Other junior high schools have continued to provide remedial instruction in a less coordinated fashion, with individual teachers identifying the skills to be taught and the materials with which to teach them, based on teachers' varied training in elementary school multiple-subjects or reading or high school English.

Neither the structure nor the scope of remedial instruction in junior high schools conforms to an established model, and both aspects of schooling are currently undergoing close examination and in some cases extensive renovation. For the most part, when a program of remedial instruction has been changed or perhaps articulated for the first time on any scale larger than a single classroom, it looks to local requirements for high school graduation. Any direction is better than none, but inbred planning may yield disappointing results. The rationale behind minimal competency testing is to assure that young adults can function adequately in a literate society. If curriculum and assessment designers or redesigners do

not look hard at these goals, then students will not be any better prepared upon graduation than they were before minimum competency tests were conceived.

Students who come to remedial instruction in high school today are usually there for one reason: they want to graduate. While in recent years students who could not understand the directions on an application for credit, could not read the label on a drum of industrial solvent, or couldn't make themselves understood through a letter of complaint to the manufacturer of a defective appliance could still manage to graduate from many high schools. Public outrage at the numbers of high school graduates who were functionally illiterate (couldn't read or write well enough to obtain or maintain employment or engage competently in personal or business transactions) bred support for legislation demanding that high schools do a better job of educating youth.

The well-established structure of high schools has allowed them to respond to the mandated demonstration of students' competencies almost overnight. In California, as well as in other areas, no student can graduate from high school without passing a test in reading, writing, and mathematics, the particular test and the criteria for passing determined locally. The intent of the legislation behind minimum competency testing was to release into society literate adults. But the operational definition of literacy that evolves may be a far cry from the intention of backers of minimum competency legislation. The argument for establishing a clear image of the student upon graduation is even more compelling at the high school level than it is for junior highs. For many students, high school remedial instruction is the last gas station before the freeway. That's not to say these students will not participate in any additional instruction in basic skills ever, but rather that they will only resort to this kind of instruction again if they are truly stuck, for example, can't get or hold a job without it.

Few school districts choose or develop a high school minimum competency test with a clear picture of the graduate in mind. Rather

they buy what's for sale or model their own according to what's for sale, and the form of remedial instruction inevitably follows like a shadow. While some school districts look to their curriculum to design a test, they are in the minority. And the ones that do often have a curriculum that has evolved without the sort of vision we've been discussing.

The fault lies not in the good intent, earnestness, and hard work of the curriculum committee, comprised typically of classroom teachers and curriculum specialists. People do what they know best. And school people know the academic curriculum better than any other. We're suggesting that schools need to determine first which skills their graduates must have, at the very minimum, if they are to function adequately on their own. Then, schools can look for ways to demonstrate that their students have these skills when they leave high school.

References

Bowker, R. R. El-hi textbooks in print. New York: 1979.

Educational Products Information Exchange Institute. Report on a national study of the nature and the quality of instructional materials most used by teachers and learners. Report No. 76. New York, NY: 1976.

Long Beach Unified School District. A guide for teaching basic English 7-9 (Draft). Long Beach, CA: 1981.

Blair, G. M. Remedial reading programs in senior high schools. School Review, 1941, 49, 32-41.

Other Sources of Information

Books and Articles

Anaheim Union High School District. Proficiency testing program: English remediation learning kit (rev.). Anaheim, CA: 1979.

Anaheim Union High School District. Proficiency testing program: Language, sequential continuum. Anaheim, CA: 1981.

Anaheim Union High School District. Proficiency testing program: Reading remediation learning kit. Anaheim, CA: 1981.

Anaheim Union High School District. Proficiency testing program: Reading, sequential continuum. Anaheim, CA: 1981.

Aulls, M. W. Developmental and remedial reading in the middle grades (abridged ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Bossone, R. M., & Troyka, L. Q. Strategy for coping with high school and college remedial English problems. New York: City University of New York, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 130 268.)

Carroll, J. B., & Chall, J. S. Toward a literate society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Clark County School District. Course syllabus (Remedial Reading, rev.). Las Vegas, NV: 1980.

Clark County School District. Course syllabus (Basic English I, II, and IV, rev.). Las Vegas, NV: 1979-1981.

Cowan, W. P. Remedial reading in secondary schools: Three-fourths of a century. In H. A. Robinson (Ed.). Reading and writing instruction in the United States: Historical trends. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 1977.

Cushenbery, D. C. Remedial reading in the second school. West Nyack, NY: Parker, 1972.

Functional reading: A resource guide for teachers. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1976.

Greenfield, R. An experimental and demonstration manpower program for disadvantaged youths. Final report. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, 1966. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 019 518.)

Books and Articles (cont.)

Hellman, S. G. Finding methods and materials that work for problem readers. Las Vegas, NV, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 423.)

Herber, H. L. Teaching reading in content areas (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Long Beach Unified School District. A guide for teaching basic English 7-9 (Draft). Long Beach, CA: 1981.

Los Angeles Unified School District. EDL SHARP competency kit, teacher's guide. New York: EDL/McGraw-Hill, 1978.

McAfee, J. The English skills program, teacher's manual. Newburgh, NY: Newburgh Free Academy, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 136 300.)

Robinson, H. A. Teaching reading and study strategies: The content areas. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.

Strum, I. Corrective reading, corrective mathematics and bilingual instruction of pregnant school age girls. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 142 655.)

Walmsley, S. A. On the purpose and content of secondary reading programs: An educational ideological perspective. Curriculum Inquiry, 1981, 11, 73-93.

Witte, P. L., & Otto, W. Reading instruction at the postelementary level: Review and comments. Journal of Educational Research, 1981, 74, 148-158.

Textbooks

Incentives for Learning. English for everyday living. Chicago: 1976.

Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Rally! New York: 1980.

Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Impact on reading. New York: 1979.

Houghton Mifflin. Vistas. Boston: 1979.

McDougal, Littell. Essential reading skills. Evanston, IL: 1982.

Scott, Foresman. Signal. Glenview, IL: 1977.

Tests

Anaheim Union High School District. Proficiency testing program, English. CA: Anaheim Union High School District, 1981.

Anaheim Union High School District. Proficiency testing program, Reading. CA: Anaheim Union High School District, 1981.

California achievement tests, Book 19C. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Clark County School District. Secondary remedial reading criterion referenced test (rev.). Las Vegas, NV: 1980.

Garden Grove criterion-referenced test, English, Form C (3rd ed.). CA: Garden Grove Unified School District, 1978.

Garden Grove criterion-referenced test, Reading, Form C (2nd ed.). CA: Garden Grove Unified School District, 1978.

Los Angeles Unified School District. Senior high assessment of reading performance. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Los Angeles Unified School District. Write: Junior high. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Los Angeles Unified School District. Write: Senior high. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1979.

SRA reading index. Chicago: Science Research Associates; 1977; Examiner's manual (The reading and arithmetic indexes), 1974.

Test of everyday writing skills. Monterey, CA: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1978.

People

Anaheim Union High School District (CA): M. Jene Mangan, Director of Instructional Services; Jane Leef, Testing Technician; Jan Billings and Jim Herron, Staff Development Trainers (English).

Clark County School District (NV): Pat Pearson, Reading Specialist, Secondary Curriculum Services; Carolyn Edwards, Language Arts Specialist.

EDL/McGraw-hill Book Company: Craig Garcia.

Garden Grove Unified School District (CA): George Willson, Director, Secondary Instruction; Gerald Stanley, Director, Research, Testing, and Evaluation; Don Carlos, Writing Specialist.

People (cont.)

Ginn and Company: Tricia Bloomfield.

Harcourt Brace Jovanovich: William Schell.

Holt, Rinehart and Winston: David Simala.

Houghton Mifflin Company: Jerry Crews, Kathleen Wolfe.

Howard University: John Campbell, Professor, Secondary Reading.

Huntington Beach Union High School District (CA): Christine Rice, Supervisor, Program Development; Keith Hartwig, former Director of Research and Evaluation.

Incentives for Learning, Inc.: Tom Allison.

Long Beach Unified School District (CA): Karen Goodman, Consultant, Language Arts; G. B. Garcia, Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Division; Bill Marmion, Director, Curriculum Services.

Los Alamitos Unified School District (CA): Neil McKinnon, Director of Curriculum; David Hatten, Director of Special Education and Testing; Larry Thompson, Counselor.

Los Angeles County Public Schools: Julia Gottesman, English/Language Arts Consultant; Marian Schilling, Reading/Language Arts Consultant; Walter Gembica, Consultant, Career, Manpower, and Work Experience Education.

Los Angeles Unified School District: Patricia Boerger, Director, Reading Instruction; Jesse Pinyon, Research and Evaluation; Douglas McDonald, Coordinator for Reading; Roger Hyndman, Secondary English Specialist.

Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.: Jim Knister.

McDougal, Littell and Company: Dave Sauve, C. Jay Morrett.

Mesa Public Schools (AZ): Doug Barnard, Assistant Superintendent-Curriculum.

Nevada State Department of Education: George Barnes, Evaluation Consultant.

Prince George's County (MD) Schools: Jack Cole, Coordinator of Instruction.

San Diego City Unified School District: Bob Saunders, Resource Teacher in Reading.

People (cont.)

Scott, Foresman and Company: Gerry Terpening.

Southern California Regional Occupational Center: Elizabeth Nash, Director of Research and Statistics.

APPENDIX A

WHAT THE BASIC STUDENT IS

In language skills, many basic students tend to

- Be extremely literal; e.g., lack imagination and sensitivity to subtleties.
- Be limited in positive, ordinary, actual experience; e.g., going to the beach.
- Be limited in vicarious reading experience.
- Have difficulty writing words that they can speak.
- Frequently mispronounce words or pronounce words correctly with no comprehension of their meaning.
- Be familiar with only one of the multiple meanings of a word.
- Lack vocabulary to describe their thoughts.
- Be limited in reading ability.
- Have poor spelling; e.g., do not follow rules or phonetic principles and have trouble adding affixes.
- See no connection between language and their own lives.
- Be limited in language skills needed for self-expression.
- Have difficulty in associating words and ideas.
- Have larger spoken than written vocabularies, but be extremely limited in spoken vocabulary.
- Be unable to discriminate between the general and the specific.
- Be unable to develop an idea or expand on a statement.
- Be unable to visualize or create a mental image of reading, perhaps because they lack imagination and have not practiced the skill.
- Lack a rich language background with limited positive verbal interaction with adults.

In learning, many basic students tend to

- Be more likely to have a kinesthetic learning modality than the general school population. (Thirty percent may be kinesthetic as opposed to fifteen percent in the general school population.)
- Be unable to see the relationship between a specific assignment and a general instructional goal.
- Need frequent repetition to master a skill.
- Be inattentive.
- Have disorderly work habits.
- See no need to complete assigned tasks.
- Be slow in response to questioning.
- Be unable to transfer learning; e.g., relating reading to their lives.
- Be unwilling to look at new tasks and ideas.
- Perform poorly in test situations.
- Have physiological problems of hearing, seeing, and coordination which are not corrected. Tend to have a higher absence rate, and sometimes refuse to wear glasses, etc.

In behavior many basic students tend to

Lack confidence and express it in many ways; e.g., being unsure of their performance and requesting constant reinforcement from the teacher, defending themselves belligerently, not saying anything in order to hide their lack of achievement, degrading classmates to aggrandize themselves, and claiming not to have books/materials to avoid doing work.

In behavior many basic students tend to

Fail to observe common courtesies.
Be slow starters when work is assigned and require frequent monitoring for accountability.
Be easily distracted.
Be reluctant to volunteer to speak/perform in front of the entire class but be braver to participate in a small group.
Have many excuses for not having their homework completed.
Attend sporadically or not at all.
Relate poorly to students who seem different; e.g., cruel to one another, prejudiced, withdrawn.
Adopt a bravado to cover embarrassment and often refuse to attempt classwork rather than to risk failure.
Behave impulsively, fluctuating between apathy and excitability.
Have a poor diet which is high in caffeine, sugar, salt, chemical dyes and preservatives and which may result in hyperactivity.
Associate freedom, kindness, or trust on the part of the teacher with weakness.
Simply endure school until graduation or drop out.
Have progressed through the grades despite lack of educational achievement but have dropped far behind achievement of classmates.
Be preoccupied with out-of-school activities.
Survive in the streets if not in the classroom.
Resist being taught.

In attitude, many basic students tend to

Expect failure and react to the prospect of failure by

Refusing to try, desiring to just "get by."
Appearing rebellious and defensive.
Trying but expecting failure anyway.

Be extremely limited in self-esteem.
Have an unrealistic assessment of their abilities and consequent life goals; e.g., plan to be a doctor.
Fail to see a reason for education.
Live for today--tend not to worry about yesterday or feel they have a tomorrow.
Be warm and loving on a one-to-one basis and desperately need love, affection, and reassurance.

Become extremely attached to teachers who are compassionate toward them, perhaps because they need someone to tell them that they have self-worth.
See school as social instead of education.

In background, many basic students tend to

Have little or no parental interest, support, or intervention in their lives.
Have a high rate of transiency.
Lack reading materials in the home.
Lack the development of the leisure reading habit.

(Long Beach Unified School District, 1981)

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE OF A DISTRICT CURRICULUM GUIDE LIST
OF SKILLS AND TASKS, GRADES 7-9

Listening

Skill: Listen attentively and paraphrase the main points of the speaker.

Tasks: 1. Listen attentively:

a. Identify the purpose for listening.
b. Watch the speaker to see visual clues.
c. Ignore distractions.
d. When conversing or discussing, concentrate on the speaker's message rather than one's reply.

2. Paraphrase the main points of a speaker.

a. Recall what was said.
b. Understand what was said.
c. Identify the main points.
d. Know synonyms.
e. Restate the main points (oral or written.)

Speaking

Skill: Orally express a complete thought, extemporaneously.

Tasks: 1. Express orally a complete thought.

a. Have an idea.
b. Organize the idea.
c. Have vocabulary.
d. Use appropriate vocabulary to verbalize the idea.
e. Make sentence sense (syntax).
f. Speak clearly, slowly, and audibly so the listener can follow.

2. Extemporaneously

a. Respond to a stimulus.
b. Think and organize thoughts quickly.

Reading

Skill: Silently read material on a level appropriate to student's ability and answer questions on a literal, interpretive, and evaluative level.

Tasks: 1. Read silently (on a level appropriate to the student's ability):

a. Know purpose of reading.
b. Know key vocabulary.
c. Develop concepts involved in the reading.
d. Can decode words in reading material.
e. Can use context.
f. Can understand context.
g. Can visualize.

2. Answer questions on a literal level:

a. Understand question.
b. Recall facts from the reading material.
c. Read to find facts to answer questions.
d. Confine answers to specific questions.

3. Answer questions on an interpretive level:

a. Understand the question.
b. Sift pertinent facts.
c. Organize facts.
d. Make inferences, draw conclusions, determine main idea, etc.

4. Answer questions at critical/applicative level:

a. Understand the question.
b. Comprehend the selection.
c. Distinguish fact from opinion.
d. Recognize own value system.
e. Compare facts with own value system.
f. Support opinions.
g. Present an organized answer based on facts.

Writing

Skill: Develop and support a coherent thought legibly in writing.

Tasks: 1. Write legibly:

a. Know alphabet.
b. Form letters properly.
c. Space properly.
d. Use uniform slant.

2. Develop an idea:

a. Have an experience.
b. Observe.
c. Have vocabulary.
d. Verbalize.
e. Order/categorize.

3. Support a coherent idea:

    a. Recognize main idea/purpose.
    b. Use appropriate plan for purpose.

        1) Have a sense of audience.
        2) Recognize areas where clarification/further detail is needed.
        3) Use specific language.

    c. Include only relevant details.

4. Editing:

    a. Know manuscript form:

        1) Heading
        2) Title
        3) Indentation
        4) Margins

    b. Recognize complete sentence.
    c. Recognize beginning capital letters and end punctuation.
    d. Identify misspelled words from the given list.
    e. Capitalize basic proper nouns.
    f. Recognize levels of English usage (home, peer, standard).

APPENDIX C

REMEDIAL* READING AND ENGLISH MATERIALS USED IN JUNIOR HIGHS AND HIGH SCHOOLS

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
9-12	4.0 - 6.0	EDL PAIR and SHARP Competency Kits	Reading kits (PAIR for junior high, and SHARP for high school)	EDL McGraw-Hill
7-12	5.0 - 10.0	SIGNAL (Sense, Image, Gallery, Nova, Album, Latitude)	Textbook series, one text for each grade, intended reading level for each book is 2 levels below grade	Scott, Foresman
7-12	"two to three levels below grade"	Impact on Reading (Books A-F)	Textbook series, one text for each grade	Holt, Rinehart & Winston
7-12	4.0 - 6.0	Vistas (Horizons, Summits, Tempos, Paces, Networks, Patterns)	Textbook series, 2 books written at 4.0 reading level, 2 at 5.0, and 2 at 6.0	Houghton Mifflin
7-12	2.5 - 5.5	Rally! (Levels A-C)	Textbook series, level A written at 2.5 - 3.5 reading level, B at 3.5 - 4.5, and C at 4.5 - 5.5	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
7-12	5.0 - 6.0	Essential Reading Skills (Vocabulary Development, Comprehension, Study and Research Skills, Literary Appreciation)	Workbook set, four workbooks intended for any grade, reading level graduates within each workbook	McDougal, Littell
7-12	5.0 - 6.0	Basic Skills in English (Books 1-6)	Textbook series, one text for each grade, books 1-3 written at 5.0 reading level and books 4-6 at 6.0 level	McDougal, Littell
7-12	2.5 - 8.5	Accent On Reading Skills (Books A-E)	Supplementary textbook series. Book A, reading level 2.5 - 5.5; B is 3.5 - 6.5; C, 4.5 - 7.5; D, 5.0 - 8.0; E, 5.5 - 8.5	Holt, Rinehart & Winston

*The descriptor "Remedial" refers to materials used to teach students who are substantially below grade-level expectations. Some of these materials are not designated remedial, but are used in instruction with this group of students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
6-8	1.0 - 4.0	Everyreader Series (20 titles, e.g., Ben Hur, Ivanhoe, King Arthur and His Knights, Silver Skates)	Set of abridged literature classics	Webster/McGraw-Hill
7-12		Specific Skills Reading series (Detecting the Sequence, Drawing Conclusions, Following Directions, Getting the Facts, Getting the Main Idea, Locating the Answer, Using the Context, Working with Sounds)	Supplementary work booklets	Barnell Loft
9-12		HM Study Skills Pageant (Levels I and II)	Textbook set	National Association for Secondary School Principals
		Making Sense	Textbook for reading	Globe
9-12	5.0 - 6.0	Writing Sense	Textbook for writing	Globe
7-8		Advanced Skills in Reading (Books 1 and 2)	Textbook series	Macmillan
11-College		The Now Student	Textbook for reading and study skills	Jamestown
6-9	4.0 - 5.0	The World of Careers	Single-volume textbook	Globe
	1.0 - 6.0	Map Skills (Books A-F)	Textbook series, one book for each reading level	Scholastic
9-12	2.0 - 6.0	Getting It Together: A Reading Series About People (Levels 1-3)	Textbook series	SRA
7-12	3.0 - 5.0	Job Ahead: A career Reading Series (Levels 1-3)	Textbook series, each level corresponds to a reading level (3.0, 4.0, and 5.0)	SRA

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
7-12	"low reading level"	Reading Tactics (Books A-F)	Supplement to SIGNAL, workbook series, one workbook for each grade	Scott, Foresman
9-12		English for Everyday Living	Single volume text/workbook; used as core textbook in some classes, as supplementary in others	Incentives for Learning
9-12		Basic English Concepts	Learning kit	Anaheim Union High School District
7-12		Using English: Grammar and Writing Skills (First Course-Sixth Course)	Textbook series, one book for each grade	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
		Reading Anthology (Levels 1-3)	Supplementary textbook series	Scholastic
		Real Life Writing Skills	Workbook	Scholastic
		Reading and Writing On the Job	Workbook	Scholastic
6-9		See, Say, & Write (Books I and II)	Spelling textbook. Book I intended for grades 6-8, Book II for 8-9	AMSCO School Publications
7-12		Action Stories of Yesterday and Today	Literature collection	AMSCO School Publications
7-10		Jumbo English Yearbook (4 books)	One book for each grade	Wieser Education
7-12	2.2 - 2.8 "for slow learners"	Pacemaker Classics Series (Jungle Book, Last of the Mohicans, Moonstone, Robinson Crusoe, Tale of Two Cities, Treasure Island, Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea, Two Years Before the Mast)	Set of abridged literature classics	Fearon-Pitman

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
9-12	"designed for older disabled readers"	Basic Reading Units (Facts and Details, Main Idea)	Supplementary booklets or duplicating masters	Continental Press
5-9	4.0 - 6.0	Real Stories Series (Books 1 and 2)	Book 1 reading level 4.0 - 5.0; book 2, 5.0 - 6.0	Globe
5-9	2.0 - 4.5	Sights and Sounds Series (Books 1-3)	Workbook series	Globe
7-10	4.0 - 7.5	Reading for the Real World (Levels 1 and 2)	Level 1 reading level 4.0 - 6.5; level 2, 5.0 - 7.5	Merrill
9-12		Going Out-Getting Around		Globe
2-6		Dictionary Skills Series (Books A-C)	Book A, grade levels 2-3; B, 4-5; C, 5-6	Scholastic
	4.0 - 12.0	Be a Better Reader Series (Levels A-I)	Text/workbook series, one book for each reading level	Prentice-Hall
9-12		How to Read Your Newspaper	Supplementary text/workbook	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
11-12	5.0 - 6.0	The Turner Career Guidance Series (Changing a Job, Holding a Job, Looking for a Job, Starting a Job, Training for a Job, Wanting a Job)		Follett
7-12	1.0 - 7.0	Breakthrough! Series (24 books)	Textbook series. Number of books varies at each reading level, including 2 Spanish editions at reading level 1.0	Allyn and Bacon
7-9		English Made Easier	Workbook	AMSCO
7-9		English Language Arts	Workbook	AMSCO

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
10+		RSVP (Reading, Spelling, Vocabulary, Pronunciation) (Books 1-3)	Workbook series	AMSCO
	4.0 - 8.0	Reading Achievement	Workbook	Cambridge
	4.0 - 8.0	Reading Competence	Workbook	Cambridge
	4.0 - 8.0	Reading Improvement	Workbook	Cambridge
	3.5	Follett Coping Skills Series (Budgeting, Finding Work, Getting Medical Assistance, Job Interview, Using Community Resources, Using Transportation)	Workbook series	Follett
8-10	3.0 - 4.0	Turner-Livingston Communication Series (Language You Speak, Letters You Write, Movies You See, Newspaper You Read, Phone Calls You Make, Television You Watch)	Workbook series	Follett
K-8		Spectrum of English (Books K-8)	Textbook series	Glencoe
7-12	4.0 - 6.0	Better Reading Workshop (Reading for Speed and Accuracy, Reading with Care, Making Inferences, Special Study Skills)	Workbook series	Globe
6-9	2.0 - 3.0	Journeys to Fame	Collection of biographies	Globe
6-11	4.0	Reading Road to Writing (Sentences, Verbs, Adjectives and Adverbs, Pronouns, Words Often Confused, Mechanics of Writing)	Workbook sets	Globe

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
4-6		Key Ideas in English (Levels 1-3)	Textbook series	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich
7-8		Holt Basic Reading System (Levels 16-17)	Textbook series	Holt, Rinehart & Winston
1-8		Language for Meaning (Books 1-8)	Textbook series, one book for each grade level	Houghton Mifflin
8-12		Forms in Your Future	Workbook	Globe
7-8		The Simple Sentence in Seven Steps	Workbook	McCormick-Mathers
7-12	"for average and above average students"	Building English Skills Series (Levels 7-12)	Textbook series, one book for each grade level	McDougal, Littell
4-12	2.0 - 6.0	New Practice Readers (Books A-G)	Textbook series	McGraw-Hill
7-9	1.0 - 3.0	The Learning Skills Series: Language Arts (Acquiring Language Skills, Building Language Skills, Continuing Language Skills, Directing Language Skills)	Workbook series	Webster, McGraw-Hill
4-6		Words in Motion (Kits A-C)	Multimedia kits for reading: audio tapes and worksheets	Macmillan
4-8		Skillbooster Series (Building Word Power, Increasing Comprehension, Organizing Information, Using References, Working With Facts and Details)	Workbook series	Modern Curriculum
6-12		Read, Write, React (Books 6-12)	Textbook series, one book for each grade level	Oxford

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
7-12	3.0	Planning For Your Own Apartment	Workbook	Fearon-Pitman
9-12	3.6	Getting a Job	Workbook	Fearon-Pitman
1-8		Rand McNally Reading Program (Levels 1-15)	Textbook series	Rand McNally
1-6		Basic Education Reading Series (Books 1 and 2)	Textbook series	Follett
		Scope Visuals	Transparency set for writing, reading, spelling, vocabulary	Scholastic
4-6	2.0 - 9.0	Mark II Reading Laboratory Series (Kits 2a, 2b, and 2c)	Learning kits	SRA
3-9	2.0 - 12.0	Pilot Library	Learning kits for reading	SRA
3-12		Reading for Understanding	Learning kits	SRA
7-12	3.0 - 5.0	Job Ahead: A Career Reading Series (Levels 1-3)	Textbook series; level 1 is reading level 3.0, 2 is 4.0, 3 is 5.0	SRA
1-9		Language Exercises (Books 1-8)	Workbook series	Steck-Vaughn
7-10		Touchstone Series (Getting It Across, Moving Along, Smooth Talk)	Workbook series	Steck-Vaughn
		Taskmaster cards	Learning kit for spelling, vocabulary	Taskmaster
9-12	6.0 - 8.0	Warriner's English Grammar and Composition (Second Course)	Textbook series	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

APPENDIX C (cont.)

Intended Grade	Reading Level	Title	Classification and Comments	Publisher
7-8		New Open Highways Program (Blasting Off and Orbiting Earth)	Basal reader series, one book for each grade level	Scott, Foresman
7-8		Sounds of Language Readers (Sounds Jubilee and Sounds Freedomring)	Basal reader series, one book for each grade level	Holt, Rinehart and Winston
7-12	2.4 - 7.2	Kaleidoscope Readers (Books 1-8)	Textbook series, reading levels increase with each book	Addison-Wesley

APPENDIX D

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION PROFICIENCY TESTS (OBJECTIVE)

Reading and Egnlish[a] Skills

Skill Category	A Union High (CA) Freq.	%	B Unified (CA) Freq.	%	C County (NV) Freq.	%	Draft, D Unified (CA)[b] Freq.	%	SHARP (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Write: Senior High (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	TEWS[c] (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	CAT (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Mean[f] Freq.	%
PHONETIC ANALYSIS																		
Single Consonants					3[d] R/L[e]	3.4											0	0.0
Consonant Digraphs and Blends					2 R/L	2.3											0	0.0
Single Vowels					1 R/L	1.1											0	0.0
Vowel Digraphs and Diphthongs					3 R/L	3.4											0	0.0
Consonant-Controlled Vowels					1 R/L	1.1											0	0.0

[a] Much overlap exists between the skills assessed by Reading tests and English or Language tests, and this overlap is not consistent for particular skill categories among tests. Further, students often receive remedial instruction for both reading and English skills in one class, which in some schools is called "Reading" and in others, "English." For these reasons and also because many remedial reading textbooks in use at the high school level usually include English instruction, but few remedial English texts cover reading skills, I decided to list the test skills according to the framework developed for analyzing reading textbook series. This arrangement should help us to see commonalities across language arts instruction, including assessment, no matter where it happens in high school remediation.

[b] Number of items has not been determined as yet, but proportional skill emphasis has been tentatively set by the district.

[c] This preliminary analysis of the TEWS is not based on first hand examination of items but on a published skills summary.

[d] Represents number of items.

[e] R/L designates items on a Reading Test that are administered orally and intended to access listening skills.

[f] Seven tests are included in computation of means; Draft, D Unified is excluded.

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Skill Category	A Union High (CA) Freq.	%	B Unified (CA) Freq.	%	C County (NV) Freq.	%	Draft, D Unified (CA) Freq.	%	SHARP (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Write: Senior High (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	TEWS (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	CAT (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Mean Freq.	%
STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS																		
Abbreviated Word Forms	1	1.2	3,2E[9]	3.0	2	2.3	----	3.0	4	3.3							2	1.8
Inflected Word Forms			2,2E	2.4			----	2.0, 6.0E			3E	5.8					1	0.9
Derivational Affixation	3	3.6	3	1.8	6	6.8	----	2.0									2	1.8
Expanded Words							----	3.0									0	0.0
WORD COMPREHENSION																		
In Isolation			3	1.8			----	3.0									0	0.0
In Context	8	9.5	10	5.9	25	28.4	----	3.0	2	1.7					30	16.9	11	9.8
Syntax	4E	4.8	13E	7.7													2	1.8
TEXT COMPREHENSION																		
Intrasentence	4E	4.8	11E	6.5			----	3.0E			12E	23.1	13E	13.0	19E	10.7	8	7.1
Punctuation	8E	9.5	6E	3.6			----	3.0E	2	1.7	9E	17.3	25E	25.0	15E	8.4	9	8.0
Paragraph Integrity			9E	5.3			----	6.0E			3E	5.8	5E	5.0			2	1.8
Reference	4E	4.8					----	3.0E			4E	7.7			8	4.5	2	1.8
Classifying Part/ Whole			2E	1.2													0	0.0
Sequence/Following Directions			4	2.4	3,3R/L	6.8	----	6.0	8	6.7			5E	5.0	3	1.7	4	3.6
Inference/ Conclusions/ Cause and Effect			11	6.5	3,1R/L	4.5	----	15.0	8	6.7					2	1.1	4	3.6

[9]E Designates items on an English or Language Test.

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Skill Category	A Union high (CA) Freq.	%	B Unified (CA) Freq.	%	C County (NV) Freq.	%	Draft, D Unified (CA) Freq.	%	SHARP (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Write: Senior High (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	TEWS (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	CAT (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Mean Freq.	%
Central Theme/ Details	8	9.5	11	6.5	9,3R/L	13.6	----	6.0, 3.0E	8	6.7	1E	1.9	5E	5.0	17	9.6	9	8.0
Comparison, Contrast, Analogy			4	2.4													1	0.9
LITERARY ELEMENTS																		
Narrative Structure															6	3.4	1	0.9
Stylistic Elements			6	3.6											6	3.4	2	1.8
Style/Type of Writing	8	9.5	12	7.1	3	3.4	----	3.0	5	4.2	3E	5.8			8	4.5	6	5.4
Author's Purpose			3	1.8			----	3.0							4	2.2	1	0.9
Language's Development											3E	5.8					0	0.0
LOCATION/STUDY																		
Alphabetizing			3	1.8	2	2.3											1	0.9
Dictionary/Glossary	4E	4.8	8	4.7	3	3.4			4	3.3					6	3.4	4	3.6
Encyclopedia					1	1.1											0	0.0
Other Reference Sources	4E	4.8	3	1.8	2	2.3	----	3.0, 6.0E	4	3.3					6	3.4	3	2.7
Book Parts--Index					1	1.1											0	0.0
Book Parts--Others					2	2.3											0	0.0
Graphic Aids	16	19.0	3	1.8	9	10.2	----	6.0	75	62.5	2E	3.8			13	7.3	17	15.2
DISCOURSE CONSTRUCTION																		
Mechanics	4E	4.8	10E	5.9			----	3.0E			4E	7.7	7E	7.0	10E	5.6	5	4.5

APPENDIX D (cont.)

Skill Category	A Union High (CA) Freq.	%	B Unified (CA) Freq.	%	C County (NV) Freq.	%	Draft D Unified (CA) Freq.	%	SHARP (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Write: Senior High (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	TEWS (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	CAT (CTB/ McGraw-Hill Freq.	%	Mean Freq.	%
Spelling	4E	4.8	11#	6.5							4E	7.7	25E	25.0	20E	11.2	9	8.0
Usage	4E	4.8	14E	8.3			----	9.0E			4#	7.7	15E	15.0	5E	2.8	6	5.4
TOTAL ITEMS[h]	84	100.2	169	100.3	88	99.8	----	99.0	120	100.1	52	100.1	100	100.0	178	100.0	112[i]	100.2

[h] Total percents not exactly 100 are a result of rounding.

[i] Mean frequency based on totals divided by number of tests.

APPENDIX E

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION PROFICIENCY TESTS (WRITING SAMPLE)

School District Tests

A Union High (CA)

Students are given a choice of two topics, one requiring expository writing and the other, narrative. They are asked to write a paragraph on the topic and include a topic sentence, supporting details and a closing sentence. Students can receive a total of 11 points. Paragraphs are graded on mechanics of writing, with one or two points given for creativity. A total of seven points is needed for passing. Each paper is reviewed by two teachers, and where a pass/fail difference occurs, a third teacher reviews the writing sample.

B Unified (CA)

Students are given one topic and one class period (50 minutes) to complete the writing sample. The stated purpose is to test written expression and language skills. Nineteen items are on the scoring rubric. Seven deal with paragraph structure and effectiveness, 12 with other elements. There are 7 reasons for failure:

1) papers less than 100 words
2) printing (must be written in cursive)
3) five different misspellings
4) three or more sentence fragments
5) three or more sentence run-ons
6) four language-choice errors
7) seven different category errors

Teachers score as a group with a minimum of two readings. Topics used have been a special place, a happy memory, a day at the beach.

C County (NV)

Students are required to write two samples: a letter and an essay. The topics change every testing. Scoring is holistic on a four point scale with 2.0 as the passing score. Testing is twice yearly. Ninth and tenth graders take it to see weaknesses so that special instruction can be given to individual students. If the test is passed in the eleventh grade, then the student has met the requirement.

D Unified (CA)

Students are given one class period to write on a topic chosen by a group of teachers. Scoring is done by a group of teachers; each paper is read three times. Scoring is holistic but based on a rubric that involves areas such as spelling, punctuation, usage, paragraph structure, etc. It is scored from 0-3; less than 2 is failing. The test is given from the ninth grade on. Once passed, the student has fulfilled the requirement. Failing students are put in a writing class to improve skills.

E Union High (CA)

A committee of English teachers chooses a topic and students write an essay. They are given three guide questions and it is to be written in one class period. Test is first given in the fall of 9th grade then each following year. Students must pass in 11th grade--previous passes do not count. Scored independently by two teachers on a 0-6 scale. If two scores vary by one point, scores are added (eight is passing). A two point deviation crossing four (passing) requires an additional rater.

Published Test

Write: Senior High (CTB/McGraw-Hill)

Consists of two writing samples written in a forty-minute period. Students are given two sets of information and asked to write a business letter and a biographical paragraph for a job resume. Scoring is 0-6 points, and passing score is determined by the individual schools.